DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 565 CG 016 065

AUTHOR Newmann, Fred M.
TITLE Organizational Factors and Student Alienation in High Schools: Implications of Theory for School Improvement.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 80
GRANT NIE-G-79-0150
NOTE 55p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Assessment; *Educational Change; *Educational Environment; Family School Relationship; *High Schools; High School Students; Organizational Theories; *Organization Size (Groups); School Attitudes; State of the Art Reviews; *Student Alienation; Student Teacher Relationship

ABSTRACT

While schools are not called upon to meet all human needs, they have a responsibility to strive toward an institutional life of high quality. Although there are no systematic studies of human alienation, reports on secondary education indicate that much of the secondary program breeds alienation. Theory in sociology and social psychology of organizations suggests that public comprehensive high schools could help reduce student alienation by: (1) allowing more student-parent choice in the school attended; (2) setting clear, limited, and consistent goals for schools; (3) maintaining a size of about 500-1200 students; (4) structuring the school with a low level of hierarchy and high level of student input; (5) providing more sustained contact between students and individual teachers, more cooperative activity among students, and more opportunity for students to contribute to school functioning; and (6) designing student work to encourage continuous development of "products," and to include both primal and modern activity. Analyses of 14 innovative efforts, e.g., specialized schools, flexible scheduling, career education and four main reform perspectives, i.e., the conventional role, the developmental role, structural emancipation, and the professional/technological, suggest that most reforms are not likely to reduce student alienation in a comprehensive way. (Author/MCF)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED218565

# ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS AND STUDENT ALIENATION IN HIGH SCHOOLS: IMPLICATIONS OF THEORY FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

By

Fred M. Newmann

University of Wisconsin

Madison

September, 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Final Report of the study, "Organizational Factors That Reduce Alienation in the Comprehensive High School: A Review of Theoretical and Applied Literature," prepared pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, No. NIE-G-79-0150. The views or conclusions contained in this study are those of the author and should not be interpreted as representing the official opinion or policy of the National Institute of Education, or the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

CG 016065

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to each of the following who contributed to this study by suggesting bibliography, reacting to drafts of the manuscript, or conversing with me about the topic: Jay Berger, Frank Crowther, Donald Erickson, Burton Fisher, James Garbarino, Maurice Gibbons, Gerald Grant, Bruce Haslam, Jim Jirsa, Tom Kelly, Jim Kielsmeyer, Nancy Lesko, Jim Lindemann, James Lipham, Cora Marrett, Linda McNeil, Mary Heywood Metz, Joy Newmann, Donald Oliver, Michael Olneck, Gary Phillips, John Quillan, Baxter Richardson, Richard Schoenherr, Cal Stone, Marilyn Watkins, Gary Wehlage, Tom Wilson, Ed Wynne. I regret that I have not been able to respond to all the perceptive advice they offered. Special thanks to Bruce Haslam for being a helpful, constructively critical Program Officer, and to Helen Wood for dedicated, competent secretarial work.

CONTENTS


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Abstract | ii |
| | Acknowledgements | iii |
| I. | Alienation | 1 |
| II. | Should School Alienation Be Reduced? | 5 |
| III. | Positive Criteria for "Non-Alienating" Experience | 7 |
| IV. | Three Levels of School Change | 9 |
| V. | Contributions of Theory to Organizational Design | 11 |
| | A. Membership | 11 |
| | B. Goal Clarity-Consistency | 13 |
| | C. Size | 16 |
| | D. Structure | 17 |
| | E. Roles | 24 |
| | F. Nature of Work | 27 |
| | G. Summary | 31 |
| VI. | Reforms in Secondary Education | 33 |
| VII. | Summary and Conclusion | 43 |
| VIII. | References | 45 |

In spite of major efforts to change school programs over the last twenty years, evidence continues to show large numbers of secondary students lacking commitment to schoolwork (Stake and Easley, 1978; Asner and Broschart, 1978). Examples of dedication, school spirit and satisfaction can be found, but seem overshadowed by persistent reports of vandalism, absenteeism, declining achievement, parental apathy and low staff morale. While there have been no systematic national studies of student alienation, reports on secondary education (Brown, 1973; Coleman, 1974; National Panel, 1976; Abramowitz and Tenenbaum, 1978; Carnegie Council, 1979) indicate that much of the secondary program breeds student detachment, estrangement, fragmentation, isolation -- in short, alienation -- rather than sustained involvement, positive identity, integration and cooperative effort.

Inquiry into alienation claims a substantial scholarly tradition, blossoming in social science from the 1950's to the early 1970's, but it has never been recognized as a central theme for the study of schooling. Yet, a variety of efforts to improve school climate or to "humanize" the school can be construed as attempts to reduce student alienation: creating smaller units such as houses within schools or alternative schools, developing special programs for marginal or talented students, individualizing instruction, giving students more voice in governance and freedom of expression. These and other well-intentioned efforts, seem like reasonable strategies for stimulating more student motivation and involvement, but how do they stand up under critical analysis? In this paper we examine the extent to which sociological and organizational theory offers support for commonly proposed innovations. In short, we ask whether social theory tells how to design schools so as to minimize alienation of students.

## I. Alienation

Discussed initially as a metaphysical or theological phenomenon, alienation represented the discrepancy between one, pure, central, unified principle of existence, Being, or God, and the lower order, material, temporal, differentiated aspects of nature. Following the evolution of the term through Christian thought to Hegel, Feuerbach, Marx, Durkheim, and contemporary sociology, we find among diverse interpretations the persistent themes of lack of engagement, separation, estrangement, and fragmentation (Lichtheim, 1968; Schacht, 1970; Ollman, 1971). Such ideas help to explain commonly observed problems of schooling. Absenteeism, failure to complete assignments, careless work, declining test scores, represent what many educators consider to be the most fundamental problem of all: low motivation, lack of engagement or serious involvement in schoolwork. Vandalism, inconsiderate treatment of adults and peers, low levels of participation in student government can be attributed to students' viewing themselves primarily as isolated, separate individuals pursuing private

Interests, rather than as morally and psychologically connected to all persons in the school community.

Alienation literature raises a major definitional issue: whether to construe it as an objective structural feature of human situations or as a subjective psychological state in individuals. According to the structural perspective, stimulated in modern thought largely by Marx and Durkheim, alienation can be assessed by examining social structure, roles, functions, and the nature of human activity. Work is alienating to the extent that workers are prevented from controlling their working conditions, from owning processes and products of their labor, from engaging in complex and integrated tasks. Human relationships are alienating when people are treated as objects (i.e., as standardized abstract units; for example, in use of grade-point averages), rather than as unique personalities; when they are manipulated to serve objectives of others, when they interact with one another primarily in limited rather than multiple roles (e.g., when student-teacher relations are confined to mastery of subject matter, rather than also including recreation, worship, general caring and affection), when high mobility and specialization in the society prevents people from developing affectional and moral bonds to community. Conditions such as these all reflect aspects of separation-fragmentation of experience, and are, by definition, alienating. This is not to say that persons will always harbor negative feelings about such conditions. They may report satisfaction in the midst of alienating experience, especially if extrinsic rewards (such as salary) are high enough. Viewing alienation from the objective structural perspective assumes that an important social reality exists somewhat independent of persons' feelings about it.

On the other hand, persons' feelings and perceptions of their world cannot be ignored; they constitute a critical part of social reality. What kinds of feelings would indicate evidence of personal alienation? Seeman's (1975, pp. 93-94), extensive review of empirical work identifies the following dimensions:

> . . . (a) powerlessness — the sense of low control vs. mastery over events; (b) meaninglessness -- the sense of incomprehensibility vs. understanding of personal and social affairs; (c) normlessness -- high expectancies for (or commitment to) socially unapproved means vs. conventional means for the achievement of given goals; (d) cultural estrangement -- the individual's rejection of commonly held values in the society vs. commitment to the going group standards; (e) self-estrangement -- the individual's engagement in activities that are not intrinsically rewarding vs. involvement in a task or activity for its own sake; and (f) social isolation -- the sense of exclusion or rejection vs. social acceptance.

Each of these reflects a sense of separation, a lack of integration or meaningful connection with values, people, tasks, and authority in one's environment.

Seeman highlighted distinctions among cognitive and affective states that might otherwise go unnoticed. One might feel powerless to affect society at large, yet, within a local religious or ethnic group, feel high levels of social support-integration (i.e., low social isolation). One might sense self-estrangement in daily work, but not feel general cultural rejection. By clarifying alternative manifestations of alienation, distinctions of this sort show that many aspects of experience must be addressed in order to promote non-alienating psychological states. (*)

While Seeman's analysis leads to examination of multiple aspects of psychological alienation, note that it does not equate alienation with all forms of negative affect. This is important, because the term is frequently used in a broader sense -- to signify almost any feeling of dissatisfaction, disappointment, disapproval, distress. Estrangement and isolation might feel diffuse and non-specific to the subject, but when the term is used to communicate <u>any</u> form of personal discontent, it becomes extremely difficult to suggest organizational or therapeutic remedies. For this reason we prefer to restrict the subjective meaning of alienation to the specific feeling states or senses recognized by Seeman. These cover enough territory to illustrate that general intervention to solve one symptom (e.g., sense of normlessness) will not necessarily solve another (e.g. sense of powerlessness).

To constue alienation only in psychological terms is inadequate. Human beliefs and feelings are subject to manipulation, false consciousness, and forms of accomodation. Students, for example, may express contentment with easy homework assignments, gaining a sense of mastery and power over the tasks at hand. If the nature of instruction is poor, however, they actually may fail to develop competence, only to discover at a later time, when properly challenged, that they have no power or mastery in the subject. Total reliance on subjective reports therefore, risks distortion. To gain a complete picture we need to step beyond the immediate feeling states people suggest and view human situations from more general perspectives that portray systems of political-economic control, organization of work, patterns of affiliation.

In this study I do not propose an "objective"structural perspective as superior to a "subjective" personal view of alienation. Rather, I find value in each and suggest that they be combined: <u>reduction of alienation requires altering structural aspects of labor and human relations in ways that affect subjective states</u>. A position of this sort seems required on the grounds that (a) to make positive gains in perceptional feelings without altering objective conditions is deception;

---

(*) While the feeling states are analytically distinct, studies often show them to be highly correlated (Long, 1980), thus lending support to the claim that alienation involves diffuse, generalized affect.

and (b) to change objective conditions in ways that fail to alleviate psychological alienation serves no useful human purpose. While the diagnosis of alienation requires "objective" information that transcends reported perceptions of participants, ultimately those perceptions must also inform our conclusions about the degree of alienation in a given situation.

In assessing alienation, from either a subjective or objective perspective, it is reasonable to ask, "alienation from what?" As a relational concept, alienation calls attention to a host of possible referents to which an individual might relate. One could be separated, estranged, isolated from a variety of objects, living organisms, social groups, institutions, spiritual forces. Marx, best-known for his analysis of alienation from one's labor or the products thereof, also emphasized alienation of persons from one another. Durkheim's discussion of anomie highlighted the individual's isolation from cohesive social networks. Recent observers concerned with the vitality of democracy focus on individuals' alienation from the political system. Ecologists criticize human estrangement from the natural world. In conceptualizing alienation in secondary schools, we should specify the referents of concern.

In addressing alienation in schools one should, ideally consider all humans who relate to the school -- students, teachers, administrators, parents, custodians, other staff, visitors. Teachers alienated in their work, would presumably affect student learning; administrator alienation would affect teacher morale, etc. (*) Some activities might be altered to reduce alienation among students (for example, through greater support for peer group solidarity), but this might increase alienation between teacher and student. Unfortunately, resources for the present study limit its scope to <u>student</u> alienation. This somewhat telescopic effort will hopefully stimulate a more comprehensive examination of relationships among all the school's constituents.

What aspects of students' experience deserve attention? We shall consider alienation from work, from humans, and from physical environment. Most importantly, students should be engaged in the instructional work of school; that is, they should demonstrate serious effort and should regard the work as meaningful. This is not intended to suggest that all students must show consistent commitment and excitement for all forms of schoolwork, but only that as a general pattern they be engaged in their studies, rather than detached from them. Students should also have civil relationships with one another and with school staff. This does not require intimate relations among all persons in the school, but that most people, regardless of status, background and personal differences, extend to

---

(*) Lipsky (1980) for example, offers an important analysis of teacher alienation in the context of their role as "street-level" bureaucrats.

one another common courtesy and fellowship-- friendly greetings, casual conversation, acts of caring in times of personal hardship. Hostile actions or faceless neutral neglect signify a rupture in civil relationships, a disjuncture among persons. Finally, the schools's physical plant should be treated with the care and pride one would bestow upon personal possessions. At minimum this suggests no vandalism; at a maximum a positive effort by students to keep the place in good repair, clean and attractive. To the extent that students show lack of attachment to their physical surroundings, we can expect estrangement from the school's general program.

II. Should School Alienation Be Reduced?

Objections have been raised that it would be unwise or inappropriate for educators to try to reduce alienation in schools. In responding to these we can elaborate further what it means to reduce alienation and explain why certain reservations need not detain the quest for less alienating schools.

Extensive literary, philosophical, and scientific research views alienation as a permanent, inevitable aspect of the human condition which need not be considered entirely undesirable. Human survival depends in part upon harmony-integration with nature, but also in a sense on humans differentiating or separating themselves from plants, animals, minerals. Individuals and groups consistently differentiate themselves from one another, apparently trying to affirm unique identities. The concept of individuality itself presupposes separation or the need for distinctions among people. The creation of art or of scientific discoveries, and the application of social innovation requires argument, dialectic, analytic detachment. Applied to schooling, this perspective on human affairs would show that learning requires struggle, conflict, the ability to abstract oneself from relationships, the tendency to dissect as well as to integrate experience. When alienation is viewed in this broader sense as any form of detachment, differentiation, or estrangement, we can see why it would be impossible to eliminate alienation. Even if it were possible, it would be undesirable, for a certain degree of "alienation" is required for student growth and learning.

We agree with the foregoing recognition of the inevitability and constructive function of differentiation and conflict. To reduce alienation, however, is not to eliminate differentiation and conflict from human experience. For some, the reduction of alienation may signify a rather euphoric, passive, consumptive state of happiness, devoid of stress and struggle, but this is a gross distortion of the concept. Persons in farming, art, business or social service can approach work with commitment and attachment or they can perform tasks perfunctorily to meet minimum requirements. The goal is not to design schools where students feel unconditional security, control, comfort, and harmony, but where they are actively involved in enterprises which they take seriously. Reducing alienation, then, is not

tantamount to eliminating stress, struggle, or effort; it is to arrange conditions such that human energy is expended in ways that enhance involvement -- engagement with work, people, and physical surroundings.

A second general objection is the observation that the goal of increasing student involvement in school life offers, by itself, an insufficient or incomplete educational agenda. Students may be energetically engaged in schoolwork but the activities themselves may have limited educational value (learning outdated material or trivia). Students may become committed participants in group life, but direct their energies in morally indefensible ways (gang wars, Nazi youth groups). Finally, students might show heightened school spirit and dedication to meaningful learning within school, but be alienated from society beyond school. Such points remind us that educational programs must also be guided by criteria other than student involvement in school life. In this sense pleas to reduce alienation in school represent an incomplete philosophy of education.

Rather than proposing a comprehensive analysis of secondary education, this study limits its attention to the role of organizational factors in reducing alienation. Even in agreeing that reducing alienation alone will not guarantee high quality education, it still makes sense to attempt to reduce alienation, for three main reasons: First, student involvement-engagement is required for learning. Teachers and others have dramatically demonstrated the difficulty of teaching passive, withdrawn students. To the extent that students remain "tuned out" in school, even while fulfilling minimal requirements, tremendous resources are wasted. Student engagement in, rather than only compliance with, schoolwork is thus a necessary prerequisite for learning. Second, assuming that the school program does promote educationally worthwhile and morally defensible aims, we find it socially and psychologically valuable for people to work and relate to one another as reasonably integrated, interdependent, active participants rather than in an isolated, withdrawn, passive pattern. The human value of non-alienating, communal life has been impressively justified through the work of Marx, Weber, Durkheim and others (summarized for example, by Nisbet, 1966, 1970). Finally, our analysis, rather than proposing a value-neutral, mindless notion of commitment-engagement, does begin to specify some criteria that can be used as guidelines to protect against moral abuses. Some activities may at first glance appear non-alienating in the sense of indicating passionate involvement and unity, but they may violate moral principles; for example, a fanatic religious cult engaged in violence against heretics, or a team of saboteurs working to poison a city's water supply. Presumably, the principles of individuality and communality, described below, would deter us from supporting such activities which might otherwise be seen as non-alienating.

Still, some will argue that schooling should undertake only the limited task of education for student competence, with no responsibility for creating non-alienating quality of life. That responsibility

should be fulfilled instead by other institutions: church, family, private associations. There are two problems with this position. First is the assumption that sufficient learning can occur within alienating environments, as people adapt to and cope with adverse conditions. Granted that learning can occur, but as argued above, great potential is likely to be wasted when students work only perfunctorily. Even if it were possible for students to learn all they "needed" in alienating environments, we must recognize the dominance of school in students' lives -- six hours a day for twelve years. To recommend only that non-school institutions must cushion students from admittedly alienating existence in schools is to excuse the school from virtually any social responsibilities beyond teaching. While school cannot be called upon to meet all human needs, it certainly has a responsibility to strive toward institutional life of high quality, so long as that mission does not interfere with the major goal of developing student competence.

## III. Positive Criteria for "Non-Alienating" Experience

Alienation has been defined in the negative sense of fragmentation, estrangement, separation, with the implication that non-alienating environments promote the opposite characteristics of integration, connectedness, commitment. It would be reasonable to search for organizational features that tend to enhance integration of experience, but this vague criterion alone may not carry us very far in illuminating how to structure schools to inspire student commitment and engagement. We can note, for example, the high degree of fragmentation in learning created through specialized coursework, 50-minute periods, and teachers certified in limited subjects. To promote integration we could suggest, for example, that courses be taught on an interdisciplinary basis, allowing longer periods of sustained study, and involving teams of teachers with more generalized competence. In spite of persistent calls for more integrated, liberal studies and many efforts in that direction, a specialized, fragmented approach to secondary education has prevailed for years. This testifies in part to the power of institutional tendencies toward differentiation, not integration of experience. To be as dominant as they have been such tendencies must be responding to a human propensity to specialize that seems equally as strong as the alleged propensity for integration.

As Ollman (1971) showed so well, plans for attacking or reducing alienation are derived ultimately from assumptions about human nature and persisting human needs. In order to suggest institutional arrangements for promoting the ideal of connectedness, engagement, integration, we must specify some criteria for human dignity other than the broad notion of integration itself. How should such criteria be expressed? Without presuming to represent the contributions of great theologians, philosophers, social theorists, scientists through the ages, let us suggest two general human characteristics or critical human tendencies which lie at

the root of human dignity and which therefore must be expressed to avoid alienation. We may call these individuality and communality.

Individuality is recognized in persistent attempts to express ideas, interests, values, temperament and personality which distinguish one person from another. It represents individuals striving for personal competence in work and play. It stands for personal choice in a variety of matters from work and politics to intimate relationships and food. Individuality involves differentiating oneself (which by definition is in a sense alienating) from other people, from institutions, from authority, but as Erikson (1960) showed, it also requires integrating oneself with others, with ideals, with social institutions.

Communality refers to the tendency to affiliate with others, to identify oneself with human groups, organizations, causes. It is recognized through such collective enterprises as churches, unions, political parties, sewing clubs, neighborhood organizations. Through communal experience humans become attached to one another such that they belong within some human family or multiple "families." Commundal bonds tend to strengthen partly because groups isolate and differentiate themselves from one another (Protestants and Catholics, East High vs. West High). Thus, communality expressed within one group seems to involve alien relationships with other groups.

The human tendencies toward individuality and communality might be considered universal "needs" or conditions that must be fulfilled for persons to become involved, connected, integrated, in an objective and subjective sense, with work, people and physical surroundings. The ideas of individuality and communality are offered here not to convey a comprehensive scheme of human needs (we have not mentioned such critical areas as physical health, economic security, transcendent meaning), but rather to suggest positive criteria toward which organizations might strive in order to reduce member alienation. Such criteria, when added to the primary consideration implied by the definition of alienation itself, that is, the integration of experience, provide a perspective for examing literature on organizations and assessing particular innovations in secondary education.

By construing the reduction of alienation as equivalent to promoting individuality, communality and integration, we have simplified, but drawn upon a rich tradition of scholarhisp. Such criteria respond to Seeman's (1972) distinctions among forms of alienation, as follows. Individuality and communality both suggest

antidotes to "powerlessness;" that is, the need for control and autonomy, or the opportunity for humans intentionally to affect reality rather than being totally determined by it. Communality, by stressing the importance of persons' integration in group life, addresses alienation attributed to "social isolation" and "value isolation." Individuality calls for activities allowing individuals to express their true tastes, temperament and values so as to avoid "self-estrangement." The criterion of integration confronts issues of "meaninglessness" and "normlessness" by stressing consistency and interdependence in experience, rather than contradiction and fragmentation. Based on anthropological work, Oliver (1976) offered a conception of bio-social needs that highlighted the tension and necessity of balance between the "primal" drive for security, stability and unconditional acceptance in small group life (communality) versus the "modern" emphasis on personal choice, novelty and individual development (individuality). Katz and Kahn's (1978) summary of the vast literature in social psychology identified three main sources of intrinsic motivation: value expression and self-identification, self-determination, and affiliative expression, each of which appears in our criteria. Of course, these recent analyses owe a great deal to the seminal sociological work of people like Marx, Durkheim, Tonnies, Weber, and to political philosophy from Plato to Rousseau. Without drawing explicit connections between our categories and the work of such theorists, it should be clear that much of human history can be interpreted as the struggle to achieve individuality and communality, with some balance between the two (Nisbet, 1962). These concepts, then, along with the general quest for integrated experience, will assist us in searching the literature for clues or principles on how to design organizations to reduce alienation.

## IV. Three Levels of School Change

Schools, like other organizations, adopt a variety of practices, presumably to improve the quality (or efficiency) of their work. While most educational practices are not characterized or publicized as efforts to "reduce alienation," many can be construed in this light if they claim to increase client or staff integration with organizational goals and activities. In this sense, actions as diverse as opening the school at night, ordering new books in the library, offering a new course, providing in-service training, or deliberately reducing school size might all be seen as efforts to reduce student alienation. In general, innovations might be targeted at three levels: the organizational level involving, for example, the governance structure or the process for establishing school goals;

the program level, involving the type of academic and non-academic experiences offered; or the staff level, involving criteria for professional preparation and performance. By focusing at the organizational level, our study deals with only one general dimension of schooling.

The sociological tradition that conceptualized alienation drew attention to the organizational level by noting how, during a process of modernization, factors such as population density, mobility, role specialization, centralization of authority, formal-contractual relationships and value pluralism tended to separate people from work, from one another, from their physical surroundings. In technologically advanced culture, concern with adult alienation at the workplace has led in many firms to modifications of organizational process: recognition of unions, profit-sharing, worker participation in plant governance and the setting of work goals. The long-standing concern in the sociological tradition with structural features of social life suggests that changes in schools' organizational factors could also reduce alienation, but what organizational issues ought to be addressed? Schools have introduced such changes as smaller, alternative schools and decentralized houses, flexible scheduling of instruction, assigning students to long-term advisory groups, modification of the way students are grouped or tracked for instruction. These illustrate school changes at the organizational level, but their potential for reducing student alienation, or for promoting individuality, communality, integration needs to be examined.

Schools attempt to improve education also by making changes in program, which often involve no significant effects on organizational structure. New curriculum in career education might be added. Social studies instruction might increase its attention to minorities. Women's athletics might be expanded. Opportunities in community service for credit might be offered. A work-study program might find new placements that attract more student interest. School practices outside the formal curriculum might also be modified to increase student involvement: ceremonies and celebrations to reward students' achievements; inviting stimulating speakers to address school assemblies; promoting special festivals at school. Modifications such as these create specific activities that students would find rewarding, and thus this represents a program strategy for reducing alienation. Some program changes may require modification of organizational features; for example, allowing increased student choice in selection of teachers, or changing the schedule to allow for semester-long projects away from school.

The final general strategy, recognizing the critical role of teacher and administrator style in relating to students and to one

another, is to modify staff performance. Students can detach themselves from school primarily because of the way adults treat them. Staff may be too authoritative and arbitrary, or too permissive and ambivalent; they may discriminate, however unintentionally, against certain groups of students. They may convey excitement and commitment or boredom and lethargy. Some will argue that the key to reducing student alienation is not to change the school organization or the program, but to concentrate on providing effective staff. A vast literature points to the major impact which principals seem to have on their schools (Goodlad, 1975; Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980). Presumably the skilled, creative principal, through administrative style, can reduce alienation in a school without making visible changes in organization or program, but through less tangible ways of inspiring school spirit.

The point of distinguishing between organizational, program, and staff levels is not to reify their independence from one another, but to indicate that change at one level may have only minimal impact unless accompanied by change at other levels. By reducing the size of schools, for example, we affect an organizational variable which seems critical if members of the school are to relate to one another on a personal basis. Students in small schools, however, may be quite alienated from their schoolwork, because of outmoded program content. Even if the content of courses matches student interests and needs, uninspiring staff may prevent students from engaging deeply in the material. Throughout this study our focus on the possible relationship of organizational features to student alienation must be interpreted in the sense that some organizational factors may be necessary, but not sufficient for reducing alienation in schools. A more complete analysis would discuss the relationship between organizational, program and staff factors.

## V. Contributions of Theory to Organizational Design

We now begin a review of selected scholarship in the sociology and social psychology of organizations to determine the extent to which we might find a clear, consistent set of guidelines for designing organizations to minimize alienation of members. The discussion will analyze the relevance of key concepts in the literature to our criteria of individuality, communality, and integration. The organizational features to be examined are membership, goals, size, structure, participant roles, and the nature of student work. While the implications we draw from general theory can be applied to schools from elementary to higher education, we choose to highlight their relevance to the public comprehensive high school, because of obvious symptoms of student alienation there and because such schools come closer to resembling modern corporate bureaucracies than do schools serving younger children.

### A. Membership

Organizations vary in their purposes, whom they claim to serve, the nature of member or constituent involvement. The basis for

persons' affiliation with an organization may affect its potential for promoting individuality, communality and integration among members. Several taxonomies have been proposed to distinguish among different organizational types (cf. March, 1965; Corwin, 1974; Dachler and Wilpert, 1978). Blau and Scott (1962) differentiated, for example, among the primary beneficiaries of organizations. Mutual benefit groups such as labor unions and voluntary associations aim to serve the interests of rank and file participants. Business concerns benefit primarily owners and managers. Service organizations ostensibly aim to benefit clients or outsiders who have regular contact, as in schools or hospitals. Commonweal organizations ideally aim to benefit the public at large. One would expect the least alienation in mutual benefit associations where people voluntarily join together to promote common interests. The voluntary basis of membership and assumed consensus of purpose in mutual benefit groups would seem to offer high promise for responding to individuality and communality. Schools, however, are designed presumably as service organizations for student clients. As such they should hopefully promote the individuality of each student member, but in the United States, the compulsory basis of student membership, and other functions of schooling discussed below, works against this. Generally, client-serving organizations, because of their primary attention to individual needs, also fail to promote communality among clients, but this is hard to determine without knowing more about the organization's particular goals and governance structure.

Etzioni (1961) drew connections among the sanctions or power wielded by an organization and the kinds of involvement of members. Power can be viewed as coercive (use of legal or physical force), remunerative (economic rewards), or normative (based on conscience or value commitments). In coercive organizations such as prisons, members' involvement was classified primarily as alienative; in remunerative organizations (business or labor unions) as calculative; and in normative organizations (churches, service fraternities) as moral. Schools use a combination of coercive (attendance required by law), remunerative (diplomas lead to jobs) and normative (education valued as an ideal, a way to "better oneself) power. The coercive aspect of schooling carries much potential for violation of individuality. The remunerative basis may be highly motivating for some individuals, but within an individually competitive economy, it works against communality. To the extent that schools are organized to maximize intrinsic or "moral" commitment, alienation would be reduced.

Together, the two frameworks just summarized suggest that student alienation would be reduced if student membership in schools grew out of voluntary decisions by groups of students and their parents to develop particular schools to educate for the particular purposes shared by a given constituency. Parochial and private schools (and some public schools) do operate in this fashion.

B. Goal Clarity-Consistency

While, ideally, member involvement should be voluntary and based on shared normative commitments, this offers no guarantee of goal clarity and consensus. A substantial literature shows that most complex organizations manifest ambiguous and conflicting goals (March, 1965; Corwin, 1974; March and Olsen, 1976). Weick (1979) even argued that persons often join an organization not as a mechanism to pursue common goals shared by individuals, but as a common means through which each person can pursue diverse goals. Goal confusion in public secondary schools manifests itself (a) through functions of schooling that differ from and sometimes conflict with schools' most obvious purpose, instruction; (b) through conflicting priorities within the different functions; and (c) through lack of consistency between professed ideals and institutional practice. We will consider how these aspects of goal confusion affect individuality, communality and integration.

The goals of schooling can be construed in terms of five functions suggested by Spady (1974): instruction, socialization, custody control, credentialing and selection. These can conflict or interfere with one another. Instruction in social studies might benefit from extensive student involvement in community affairs, but this might weaken the custody-control exerted by the school. Effective socialization to particular adult norms (e.g., punctuality or the work ethic) might be undermined by instruction if instruction calls for critical analysis of the norms themselves. The labeling of students for the purpose of selection for future careers can conflict with socialization, since students labeled as academic failures are less likely to identify with mainstream social institutions.

Conflicts or inconsistencies among functions of schooling exacerbate alienation, primarily by throwing up roadblocks to the integration of students' experiences in school. Such conflicts, when perceived by students, convey meaninglessness, normlessness, hypocrisy. The confusion prevents students from developing both individual and communal identity with the enterprise of schooling. As schools continue to perform functions other than instruction, conflict between functions is likely, but alienating effects can be minimized if goal consistency, individuality and communality are promoted within each function and if appropriate distinctions between functions are made in enforcement of standards. Students' records of achievement (grades), for example, should not be affected by students' disciplinary histories; student failure to succeed on instructional tasks should not be punished by disciplinary action; students who respond well to the school's socialization efforts should not gain special privileges in instruction. It may be difficult to maintain such independence among functions, but failure to do so can rob instruction of its integrity and inflict other kinds of injustices that make it difficult for students to identify with school.

While functions may conflict with one another, conflict also occurs within each function. Disagreement reigns over the central punposes of instruction (e.g., the learning of history as fact or as problematic inquiry), socialization (e.g., teaching of traditional roles-values vs. critical questioning of conventional institutions), custody (how closely should halls, lunchrooms, study halls be supervised), credentialing (use of grades vs. other indices of achievement). The problem of goal clarity and consensus is particularly striking in the area of instruction. We need not review the multitude of pressures on the comprehensive high school for special kinds of instruction in college preparatory, vocational and extra curricular offerings. As a public institution ostensibly bound to serve all constituents, schools have adopted a set of courses and activities so diverse as to obscure any central instructional mission except one analogous, perhaps, to a supermarket: provide enough options so everyone will find something they desire.

The secondary school's pursuit of diverse and conflicting educational goals can be defended as a way of promoting individuality, but must be criticized on two counts. First, the lack of a central instructional mission in which all students participate works against communal commitment to the school. Second, the existence of potentially inconsistent instructional experiences increases the likelihood that students' individual courses of study will lack integration. Individual choice without integration can exacerbate alienation. To reduce goal confusion in instruction, schools would have to define their missions in more limited ways and eliminate options extraneous to the central mission. Several reports suggest the need for more intense and more specialized instructional programs during part of the secondary education experience (e.g., Coleman, 1974; Carnegie Council, 1979). If because of public pressure a school must retain a "supermarket" collection of goals, it could reduce goal confusion to some extent by maintaining consistently high expectations for student performance and conduct in each course and activity.

A final dimension of the goal ambiguity problem is the discrepancy between professed, ideal goals of school and actual practices that apparently contradict them. Students, parents, teachers know that many students graduate even though they have learned almost nothing from school. Some teachers teach poorly, but receive high salaries. Organizational policy endorses equal opportunity, but some students are consistently discriminated against. Such inconsistencies signify a normlessness that obstructs student commitment to the school organization. There is no way to ensure that schools achieve all the ideals they may set for themselves, and students must learn to function in an imperfect world. Nevertheless, organizations can take steps to set for themselves only those goals that are reasonably attainable for most members, and can create a governance structure to facilitate communication on this problem.

Thus far our analysis suggests that schools should articulate clear and consistent goals that elicit a wide consensus among members of the school community. We have explained why schools with goals of this nature should be less alienating than schools characterized by goal conflict and ambiguity. (*) It is important to qualify this claim so as to refrain from endorsing highly dogmatic, socially homogeneous schools which might meet our criteria of integration and communality, but could fall short on individuality. While we have emphasized consensus and commitment to reasonably well-defined goals, note, in the spirit of earlier remarks, this is not tantamount to eliminating ambiguity, risk, tension and struggle in students' schoolwork. All of these are necessary for learning, for the development of individuality and communality. The challenge, then is to build a set of goals that are clear, internally consistent, compatible with commitments of the clientele served by the school but which also respond to individual variability and which summon committed effort.

Comprehensive high schools face great difficulty in achieving greater goal clarity and consistency. To the extent that they must serve a diverse population, holding conflicting values about the ultimate purposes of education, consensus on a limited set of goals will elude them, especially when the American ideology of pluralism is interpreted to mean that all interests should have equal opportunity to influence educational aims. If value conflict runs through the society at large and if each public school is obliged to represent all parties to that conflict, then schools are most likely to adopt as goals only vague slogans, for these give an illusion of public consensus while permitting the school to pursue the diverse, conflicting aims represented in the larger society. At first glance this strategy would seem to foster individuality and, with local political control of schools, also communality. We have explained above, however, the ways in which institutional goal conflict and ambiguity inhibit individuality, communality and integration.

A second issue in achieving goal clarity is raised by studies of the internal functioning of schools which characterize them as "loosely-coupled" organisations. According to this view (discussed below under structure), the nature of teaching itself defies tighter coordination toward centrally agreed upon goals, at least in the

---

(*) The study by Rutter et al (1979) found that the most effective schools in terms of achievement, records of delinquency, attendance, and students' participation in school beyond the required time, were schools showing a high degree of consensus on goals and enforcement of rules, that, is, little ambiguity as to the school's expectations. While this study did not focus on student alienation as defined here, such findings seem consistent with our conclusions.

American context in which teacher autonomy and academic freedom are valued. It may well be inappropriate to impose strict bureaucratic control and integration on the daily work of teachers, but private schools and schools in other cultures do maintain clear and consistent goals, while at the same time permitting teacher autonomy to achieve those goals with diverse students. Goal ambiguity therefore, would not seem to be an inevitable result of permitting teachers to exercise professional discretion in their practice. Rather it would seem to be more a function of the point raised above -- value confusion in the society at large.

C. Size

Applying our criteria to the question of school size, schools should contain people in sufficient numbers (a) to offer individuals the variety of resources necessary to develop individual interests and competence and (b) to accomplish whatever collective purposes a school might set for itself. On the other hand, the number of students should be small enough to allow enough sustained contact among students and staff to facilitate sensitive responses to one another's unique needs, to develop affiliative bonds, to become integrated in the communal life of school.

Systematic empirical study of the effects of school size on student alienation has not been conducted, and Schneider (1980) summarizes many unanswered questions in school size research. Existing research on student participation in school activities (Barker and Gump, 1964) and vandalism-delinquency (Garbarino, 1978; Gottfredson and Daiger, 1979), however, favors small schools, that is those with about 500-1200 students. The many efforts to create smaller alternative schools or house systems within large schools testifies to the validity of much theoretical commentary on the alienating features of large social organizations. While large schools may provide greater economic resources to serve both individual and communal needs, greater opportunity for personal choice, and a degree of anonymity, all of which may enhance individuality, students can easily become "lost" in the crowd, detached from other persons similarly situated and from significant communal identity. In contrast, small schools, by offering more integral contact among all members of the organization, increase the possibility of persons responding to one another's total personality and of developing affiliative ties to the organization (Garbarino, 1980).

Yet, small schools should not be endorsed unconditionally as always less alienating than large ones. Small schools can suppress individuality by imposing rigid standards of conformity, and they can suppress communal self-determination if governed through dictatorial methods. To protect against such dangers, one might opt for large schools, noting that even such large corporate entities as nations, unions, or business enterprises, can inspire passionate loyalty and collective commitment. A large voluntary organization with consensus

on clear-cut goals may be less alienating than a small one with compulsory membership and ambiguous goals. Realizing that alienation is determined by factors other than size, we can begin to resolve the question of size by identifying other critical factors and then asking whether, given these conditions, small schools would be preferred to large. Assuming goal clarity, with some latitude for individuation, and adequate instructional resources; assuming a reasonably just administration that attempts to be responsive to student input, the small school, because of the opportunity it provides for sustained contact among all members, is more likely to promote individuality, communality and integration.

D. Structure

Scholarhsip on organizations yields no single category scheme consistently applied to describe organizational structure, but three issues are commonly discussed: hierarchy, participation in decision-making, and the difference between "rational" and "natural" models. How might each of these relate to individuality, communality and integration in the experience of members?

Hierarchy. Degree of hierarchy varies according to (a) the number of superordinate-subordinate role relations from that office holding final responsibility, down to those offices holding the least responsibility for the organization's activities; and (b) the extent to which each worker is closely supervised or may act only after receiving approval from a supervisory authority. Typical secondary school hierarchies have the five levels of superintendent, principal, department chair, teacher, student. The long chain of command from student to superintendent, however, may be only occasionally salient for students (e.g., a teacher might inform students of her private objection to a school rule, but not be able to change it because of "central office policy"). In contrast, an independent neighborhood grocery might have only two levels: owner-manager and employee. In secondary schools, students' work is closely supervised by teachers who issue daily instructions on what kind of work is to be performed and who continuously pass judgments on its quality before assigning new work (e.g., unit tests prior to new units of study). In contrast, professors or doctors pursue their work generally without close daily supervision from superiors.

A high degree of hierarchy would seem to obstruct both individuality and communality. To the extent that a supervisor continuously directs one's work, one is denied individuality. Conceivably one could hold values and preferences identical to one's superiors, and, therefore, experience few threats to individuality, but as hierarchy increases, the likelihood of suppressing individuality increases. High degrees of hierarchy would also seem to inhibit communal affiliation among persons at unequal status levels; as persons must relate to one another in subordinate-superordinate roles, it becomes difficult to perceive common concerns. Students in a hierarchical school

may show high affiliative commitment among peers, but less to the staff or to the school organization as a whole.

Hierarchy may be judged to promote integration in the sense that its very purpose is to effect efficient coordination of organizational activity. It is questionable, however, that hierarchieal relations can be executed in such a way that all members experience integration. To the extent that hierarchy accentuates relations of superiority-inferiority and is instituted primarily to foster integration from the point f view of offices at the top, it will fail to promote integration in the experience of members at the bottom.

In short, organizations with low degrees of hierarchy would seem to be potentially less alienating than complex hierarchies. No doubt certain large and intricate hierarchies such as the church, military services and some business corporations can stimulate an impressive sense of individual expression and communal commitment among members. The psychologically positive results of such organizations, however, seem less the result of hierarchy itself than of other factors such as the organization's goals and mission, and ways in which the nature of work may be intrinsically satisfying to members. Such features may compensate in some sense for the alienating nature of hierarchical relationships.

Participation in Decision-Making.

To the extent that all members of an organization participate directly in setting goals and policies, the organization is considered to have a democratic or participatory structure. To the extent that goals and policies are determined by only a few members in the organization, its structure is characterized as autocratic or elitist. While degrees of hierarchy seem related to decision-making structures, they are not equivalent. Within a democratic or participatory structure for setting organizational goals, specific work tasks could be organized into a complex hierarchy. Conversely, an organization might set general policy in a highly autocratic or elitist fashion, but delegate considerable autonomy and discretion to employees in the conduct of daily work (low hierarchy).

We would expect participatory structures in principle to promote individuality, communality and integration, because, by definition, such structures allow individuals to express themselves, and they require that decisions be made collectively, taking the interests of all into account. On the other hand, democratic participation often involves conflict, and because it raises expectations for self-determination, can have the effect of dramatizing to minorities or to persons who consistently "lose," an apparent denial of control over

their destiny. Communality may be endangered if governance decisions accentuate polarities that divide members, rather than shared values that bind them. Conversely, benevolent autocrats in small organizations, while allowing most members no formal decision-making authority may inspire great loyalty, caring and mutual commitment by responding sensitively to members as they give informal input on matters of governance.

A teacher in a rural school might deny formal decision-making power to all of the school's twenty students and dictate each lesson without asking for student input. A teacher in an urban high school seeing 150 students per day might formally seek student reactions through questionnaires and also follow some students' suggestions. Ostensibly the urban students participate more than the rural ones in institutional decisions. It is possible, however, that size and culture of the rural school permits the teacher to be personally sensitive to the needs of each student such that most students feel a sense of control. In the urban school, however, even with the right to formal input, the larger number of students decreases the chances that any one student's ideas will be accepted. Cultural diversity in the urban school may also make it difficult for all students equally to be heard. Students in the rural school may be more closely supervised and have less formal input in decision-making than those in the urban school. In this sense, the rural school might be considered more "autocratic" but also less alienating.

The issues of hierarchy and participation in decision-making can be combined in the notion of centralization. Hoy et al (1980) in their review of other work (especially Aiken and Hage, 1966) defined highly centralized organizations as those with high hierarchy and low participation of members in organizational goals and policies. Decentralized organizations are those with low degrees of hierarchy and wide member participation in decision-making. Is one general structure more likely than the other to promote individuality, communality, integration?

In a prima facie sense, we should favor decentralized structures, for their authorities, by definition, are more directly accountable to members. This preference is evident in persistent efforts to save neighborhood schools, to protect departmental autonomy within schools, to create alternative schools, to build democratic work groups in industry, all of which represent attempts to pursue locally determined goals rather than following directives from a distant central source. (*)

---

(*) Support for decentralized participatory structures is found in literature on intrinsically motivating aspects of primary groups (Katz and Kahn, 1978), democracy at the workplace (Zwerdling, 1978), democracy within schools (Kohlberg, 1980), and the role of mediating structures in society (Berger and Neuhaus, 1977).

From an objective point of view centralized institutions are alienating, for they require persons at the low end of the hierarchy to engage in activities prescribed by authorities who exercise roles and competence distant from their own experience. Conclusions regarding subjective alienation in centralized or decentralized structures depend in large part, however, on whether persons in authority act in concert with the values of members, and this is more likely in decentralized structures.

Hirschman (1970) offered a novel conception of the ways in which workers, consumers, and clients participate to affect an organization's renewal or stagnation. The most obvious vehicle is "voice," that is, telling decision-makers how to run an organization by participating directly in its governance. Formal opportunities to exercise voice cannot be effective unless backed by power -- the legal right to choose decision-makers, to control property, etc. In most organizations clients, workers and consumers have no legal power to exercise voice, but they often have the economic power to "exit," that is, to withdraw from the organization, to desert it, and thereby deprive it of the power to function at all. The power of exit is most apparent in the marketplace when consumers refuse to purchase products, and businesses fail. At one extreme, where consumers have easy opportunities to exit and no voice in an organization, the business can deteriorate and fail. At another extreme, in organizations such as prisons or schools, where clients have no opportunity for exit and very slight opportunities for voice, the organization can deteriorate continuously but will remain in operation. Each extreme is alienating. Excessive opportunities to exit may bring some sense of individual choice, but a highly fragmented one, with few possibilities for communal attachment to the organization. With no opportunities to exit and no power behind voice, persons are denied opportunities to express both individuality and communality.

An ideal structure for participation would provide formal channels of voice, and these should be backed up by the potential threat of exit. Exit, however, should come at some price, because if constituents leave an organization too quickly their intelligent voices will be lost, depriving the organization of important advice for renewal. To improve, organizations need a mass of "loyal" constituents willing to work for renewal rather than to leave at the slightest disaffection. For this reason an organization needs a certain level of monopoly or holding power, balanced, however, by effective mechanisms for constituent voice and the eventual possibility of constituent exit to cripple the organization.

In applying this analysis to schools, note that students have no official powers of voice or exit. (*) Voucher systems increase the

---

(*)See Seeley (forthcoming) for a more detailed discussion of Hirschman's ideas applied to education.

power of exit, but these or other plans for voluntary withdrawal could make exit too easy. Promotion of individuality within a communal context requires a delicate balance between exit and voice, grounded in loyalty. Rather than working toward this balance, public policies have attempted to regulate other matters in the school, from safety to racial integration to competency testing, leaving the participation structure untouched, with students blocked from exercising both voice and exit.

One might question expanding formal student participation in school governance, because of their role as clients less knowledgeable than staff, and because of the fact that citizens often fail to participate in governance even when they have legal right to do so. Widespread disagreement over the central purposes of secondary education, however, may justify the need for more constituent voice in this enterprise, compared to other enterprises with clearer goals (e.g., professional athletics or manufacture of tv sets). Because public education was founded for its potential contribution to enhancing democracy, it seems ludicrous to hamper the exercise of democratic participation by students in school governance. Practical considerations of enhancing student voice in secondary schools often do present problems (e.g., how can significant student input be stimulated and used without creating burdensome formal devices for student participation), but we should not permit difficulties of implementation to obscure the critical relationship between participation and alienation (*) While student participation is necessary for promoting individuality and communality, it is not by itself sufficient, as should be clear from our attention to several other organizational characteristics.

---

(*) Ehmann and Gillespie (1974) studied student attitudes in five types of schools, categorized according to decision-making structure as elite, bureaucratic, coalitional, directed participant (where students had token opportunities to participate, but where teachers and administrators controlled most outcomes), and participant (with diverse and open leadership roles and relatively equal resources for all to participate in the school's political life). Students in participant schools had consistently the most positive attitudes on trust, integration and political confidence. Epstein and McPartland (1977) found that students in secondary schools with openness in the instructional program (student choice, individualization and physical freedom) and with high student participation in classroom decision-making showed more positive attitudes toward teachers, school tasks and school itself than students in "traditional" schools.

Rational vs. Natural Models. A major deterrent to those who try to change organizations is the observation, supported by several studies, that organizations have lives of their own, largely unresponsive to deliberate intervention by rational planners. We can address this issue by summarizing in Table 1 two dominant views of formal organizations. In distinguishing between rational and natural models I have adapted material presented originally by Gouldner (1959) and summarized by Corwin (1974). In a rational organization, goals are clear, consistent, and subscribed to by all members who work in a coordinated fashion to achieve those goals. By contrast, natural organizations have ambiguous, conflicting goals, with members more committed to personal interests than to the organizational mission. In natural organizations power is diffused such that central control-coordination is difficult, and activities are directed primarily toward organizational survival and the vested interests of groups within.

TABLE 1. Features of Rational and Natural Organizations

| Rational | Natural |
|---|---|
| . goals clear, consistent | . goals ambiguous, conflicting |
| . member commitment to organization's goals | . member commitment to personal interests |
| . activities aimed toward achievement of organization's goals | . activities aimed toward private interests of members and organizational survival |
| . activities coordinated | . activities not coordinated |
| . leadership with adequate power and resources to plan and coordinate | . no person or group with adequate power and resources to plan and coordinate for the organization |

- - - - - - - - - - - -

Research by Weick (1976), March and Olsen (1976) and others describes complex organizations performing more as natural rather than rational systems. Corwin (1974) and Deal and Celotti (1980) make the case with reference to schools as "loosely-coupled" organizations in which activity of one component (e.g., science class) has little impact on another (e.g., band). The school's formal hierarchical structure does not bring close coordination among units, and it exercises little direct control over specific teaching activities (Abramowitz and Tenenbaum, 1980). Loose-coupling seems appropriate to the "soft" technology of teaching, with its reliance upon teacher judgment and intuition in the absence of confirmed techniques for teaching specific competencies to specific types of students (Meyer and Rowan, 1978; Meyer et al, 1979). Only when one knows precisely what means lead to particular ends is it reasonable to use a tight, rational model of organizttion. Thus, teachers operate with much discretion, autonomy, minimal supervision and coordination. Generally schools provide insufficient information for assessing the

effect of school as a whole or of individual teachers on students. This loosely-coupled "natural" structure can irritate lay and professional people alike who call for clearer accountability, more visible results from the expensive public enterprise of schooling. It is often assumed that techniques of rational industrial or bureaucratic management would enhance student learning, with greater efficiency and public accountability.

Assuming that we wish to minimize alienation, that is, to enhance individuality, communality and integration, does it make sense to strive toward either the rational or natural model? Several authors, from Weber to Merton, have shown how the attempt to rationalize human activity can lead to impersonal bureaucracies with the most alienating results. Recently Wise (1979) traced the effects of specific public policies to rationalize the school toward greater equity (e.g., desegregation and mainstreaming) and greater productivity (competency based testing). Due to lack of knowledge about how to teach, there is great danger that in the zeal to increase productivity, one may specify ends that cannot be attained and/or impose means that do not lead to attainment of desired ends. Such attempts to rationalize school management can threaten,rather than strenthen, the school's very ligitmacy, because increasing the formal rules (procedures) also increases the probability that some rules will not be followed, and that rules may be followed, but not lead to desired outcomes. Even if it were possible to manage the school as a well-oiled machine, producing products and services on schedule exactly as promised, the level of hierarchy and control could be so great as to stifle much individuality and communal expression. This cautions us not to strive blindly toward structuring schools according to a rational model.

The natural model offers no better solution. It highlights major obstacles to improving organizational performance. It properly calls attention to individual and organizational interests that may obstruct the organization's official mission. Yet if we assume that organizations behave invariably only in a natural fashion, we would have to abandon all deliberate attempts to enhance individuality and communality within organizations. Fortunately, we need not give up this quest, because experience shows many successful instances of organizations designed rationally to respond to individual and communal needs.

If we assume that organizations might be designed in ways that promote either rational or natural styles of operation, it makes sense to opt for the rational model. This follows in part from our earlier explanation of how goal clarity-consistency is required as a foundation for individuality and communality. In contrast, to reinforce natural processes would be tantamount to encouraging fragmented effort, pursuit of status instead of intrinsically rewarding work, and rejection of communal expression. The general recommendation to work toward rational structures is made with full awareness that if applied

indiscriminately to the modern comprehensive high school the rational ideal can spawn cynicism and disillusionment -- through discoveries that some official goals are not achieved and that much of school life seems immune to rational coordination. Attempts to implement the rational model must also resist the temptation toward bureaucratization, or what Wise called "hyper-rationalization," and this might best be avoided by keeping the goals of individuality, communality and integration prominent in all planning activity.

E. Roles

Students function in particular roles, the characteristics of which help to explain the extent to which schools promote individuality, communality and integration. Here we summarize student roles in relation to teachers, to other students and to the school as a whole, as evident in comprehensive high schools.

Student-Teacher. At first glance, the student role appears nonalienating; the student attends school to receive services from teachers who work to develop student competence. In the role of client, partaking of services offered ostensibly in the client's benefit, one would ideally find great potential for the development of student individuality and integration between teacher and student; these aspects of the role suggest involvement and excitement. Unfortunately, most schools organize instruction in ways that dampen this potential. The compulsory nature of schooling, required courses, and denial of student opportunity to choose teachers all violate a major requirement of individuality: choice. While diverse topics in the curriculum and elective courses seem to offer extensive choice for students, the compulsory relationship infringes on intrinsic involvement.

In addition, the typical teacher's role prevents teachers from devoting to students the degree of individual attention and commitment symbolized in the client relationship. Generally, teachers must teach a standard body of content to students grouped in large batches, rather than designing instruction to respond to individual ability and interest. Further, the teacher must function in the judgmental role of certifier of student success or failure to the public at large, a role that conflicts with unconditional interest in student development. Contact between student and teacher is highly circumscribed. Due to subject specialization, students spend relatively short periods of time with each teacher and during that time, activities are limited to the task of learning subjects. The transiency and the lack of opportunity for student and teacher to engage in a wider range of human activities (play, dining, "housekeeping") hinders integration between student and teacher. Finally, the teacher's role as a subordinate obligated to follow dictates of other offices in the organization indicates that the teacher's responsibility lies ultimately to the school organization, not to the individual student client. Each of these aspects of the teacher's role works against development

of the trusting relationship needed for students to become engaged with teachers (Bidwell, 1965, 1970). In many cases students and teachers do develop close, mutually fulfilling relationships, but these seem to occur more by accident than through organizational structures that promote them.

Student-Student. Sources of student alienation are found not only in student relations with teachers, but also in their relations with one another. Ideally, individuality, communality and integration could be promoted if students were expected to listen to, to counsel and lend support to one another, if they had opportunities to organize peer groups aimed toward accomplishing academic work, providing recreation, offering community services, or taking care of the school itself. Except for extra-curricular activities, however, the dominant student role is for each individual student to learn material presented by the teacher. Instruction is organized largely in neglect of constructive student relations. Students are scheduled into classes with no regard for strengthening peer relations or for preserving previous associations. In fact certain peer relations are deliberately disrupted (when members of troublesome peer gooups are isolated), because of their alleged negative influence on one another. During class time, student-to-student dialogue is more often punished (as interfereing with learning) than rewarded. Group projects are discouraged as inefficient ways of learning, or because of difficulty for the teacher in evaluating individual student performance. Student-student affiliation within class is further hampered by the short time of class meetings and by changing group membership as students pass from one class to another. Opportunities for less alienating student relations are afforded in extra curricular activities (drama, music, sports) and in some vocational programs (e.g., class construction of a home).

Students do, of course, bring much of their extra-school peer culture into school (Cusick, 1973). In fact, peer affiliations and activities occupy so much student attention that, in many instances, they stymie the school's formal instructional tasks. To the extent that the school, however unintentionally, contributes to alienating relations among students themselves, it will fail to generate student trust-commitment to the general instructional mission. Being responsive to peer relations does not entail unconditional endorsement of all adolescent activities and preferences. Instead, the challenge is to organize instructional and extra-curricular activity such that students can be useful to one another and can develop affiliative bonds based not upon mutual antagonism toward school, but upon mutual

support for individual achievement and constructive communal work and play. (*)

Student-School. Thus far we have suggested how the roles of students in relation to teachers minimizes trust, integration and student individuality, and how the roles of students in relation to one another minimizes constructive forms of communality. If we consider the student role in relation to the school as a whole, we notice further obstacles to integration and communality. The transiency and circumscribed nature of students' relations to individual teachers also characterizes their relations to other adults in the school: counselor, custodian, cafeteria worker, administrator, reading specialist. Students relate to each only with regard to the narrow domain for which each adult is responsible, thus the school itself represents a collection of fragmented roles. Such role specialization prevents integration in two senses: human beings can express only a small part of their total selves with one another, and no one (except the principal) is expected to care about the school as a whole.

The familiar argument for specialization is that it supports individuality by facilitating the development of student competence in the most efficient manner. Because the science teacher has no responsibility for plant maintenance, total effort can be devoted to student improvement in science. Because the counselor need not keep up to date in a teaching field, total effort can be devoted to responding to students' vocational or emotional problems. This method of organizing human services flows from the general rationale for specialization in modern culture, a rationale that produced the assembly line and the modern hospital where doctors frequently cannot care for one anothers' patients.

The critique is not intended to oppose all division of labor. Social organizations require division in at least two senses: any individual pursuing several tasks must do them at different times (one cannot read and play ball simultaneously); and when several tasks must be done during a given time frame, it is necessary to assign different tasks to different persons (some will hunt and some will care for children). The challenge, however, is to note the ways

---

(*) Literature dealing with peer teaching and peer counseling (Sprinthall, 1979), student accomplishments in group-based service and research (issues of the Synergist, published by the National Center for Service Learning, 806 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20525), specific pedagogy to stimulate more cooperative learning in the classroom (Johnson and Johnson, 1975), and ways of promoting school spirit (Wynne, 1980) suggests a number of ways in which students' work in school might be altered to promote less alienating relations.

in which specialization tends to obstruct individuality, communality and integration, and then to attempt to minimize its negative effects; for example, through job rotation, more cooperative enterprises,and creating opportunities for members to relate in diverse activities that go beyond the organization's most obvious or "official" tasks.

One of the most striking obstacles to students' integration into the life of school is their role primarily as clients who take from the institution services to which they are contractually entitled. The role generally includes no expectation that the students are to be contributing members to the life of the school, although some schools encourage this more than others. To the extent that students are absolved from responsibility for assisting the school to operate effectively, they are likely to function only as parasites. This is an alienating role, for one cannot develop meaningful individuality, communality or integration unless one contributes to the lives of others and to social groups. Schools can emphasize student contributions and responsibility through student participation in school governance, services to others such as tutoring and assisting staff (library, audio-visual, message delivery, typing), plant maintenance and clean-up, meal preparation, or fund-raising (see Wynne, 1980, for other suggestions).

Since roles are created both by organizational structures and by particular program practices, it has not been possible to restrict our discussion of student roles to "organizational" features alone. Our analysis has implied changes that include both "organizational" and "program" variables. The general recommendation to reduce specialization and to increase the amount of sustained time that individual adults spend with individual students might be seen as an organizational change. (*) The suggestion that students have more opportunities to work in groups toward collective goals, or that they be expected to contribute to school operations may be considered program changes. Regardless of the category, conventional roles of students could be modified to promote greater individuality, communality and integration.

F. Nature of Work

Most research on alienation addresses the nature of work in adult workplaces, but does not speak to the kind of work students do to learn. Admittedly high school students differ in important ways from

---

(*) Recent studies on crime, vandalism, disruption in schools recommend that teachers have contact with fewer students each day and spend greater amounts of continuous time with them so that interpersonal sensitivities and bonds can develop (Gottfredson and Daiger, 1979).

adult workers. The student receives services from the school, but does not labor to produce goods and services for it. The student does not volunteer for the work, is not paid, cannot be promoted or assigned to leadership roles in the organization, and all students leave the organization after a standard period of time. In spite of these distinctions, general analyses of the characteristics of non-alienating work help to identify criteria which may be applied to some forms of student work. This section's discussion on qualities of work deals more directly perhaps with program than organizational features, for it considers the kinds of work that teachers ask students to perform. Nevertheless, considerations below transcend program content by speaking of general work qualities rather than of specific subjects and skills.

Using dimensions of alienation derived from Marx and others, Blauner (1964) investigated work in the industries of printing, textiles, automobiles and chemicals, and found that different technologies had different effects on workers' powerlessness, meaninglessness, isolation and self-estrangement. Blauner used six criteria for identifying meaningful work. He proposed two that correspond to our concern for individuality: (a) the product is uniquely developed by the worker, rather than standardized and produced in identical form by others; (b) the worker has some control over the pace at which work is performed and some freedom of physical movement during working hours. One criterion emphasized communality: (c) the work stimulates social integration and collective identity, either to the employing organization (which gains legitimacy by providing work consistent with the other criteria and by showing equity and fairness in traatment of workers), or to peer organizations such as unions, or primary work groups that lend personal support. Three of Blauner's criteria represent a concern for integration: (d) one performs work on a large part of the product, rather than on a limited part (e.g., painting a whole car, rather than only the left front fender); (e) the worker is responsible for a large span of the production process, rather than only one phase (e.g., conceiving of, drawing plans for, constructing and decorating a bookshelf, rather than only painting it); (*) (f) the work is consistent with, or integrated into the totality of the worker's commitments beyond the workplace (it would be alienating for an environmentalist to work in a mill that pollutes a local water supply).

Without suggesting that schoolwork be designed to approximate industrial work, we can inquire about the extent to which schoolwork meets or might be designed to meet such criteria, while at the same time advancing student competence in important subjects. With

---

(*) The significance or worker involvement in conceptualizing, planning and executing work is emphasized especially by Braverman (1974).

regard to individuality, students are usually encouraged to work individually and often may select topics of personal interest, but a large portion of the work demands standard or identical answers from all, rather than unique conclusions. Schoolwork also demands that all students complete work at a standard pace, although some programs have attempted to individualize pace of study. A tight schedule of classes and restrictions on movement within class prohibits much freedom of physical movement while schoolwork is carried on. In short, a good deal of schoolwork violates criteria (a) and (b). As indicated in our discussion of student roles, the main tasks of school are individualistic, not aimed toward communal affiliation and commitment (criterion c), although some schools can generate intense school spirit and loyalty when more communal roles are emphasized. Students may find occasional opportunities for integrated work in the sense of conceptualizing, planning, executing, and having control over a large portion of some work -- in art, rebuilding a car, writing a term paper. Most schoolwork, however, consists of fragmented, isolated assignments, rarely integrated into meaningful wholes within courses. Integrated studies between courses are even harder to find. Most schools would thus seem to fall short on criteria for integration (d) and (e), but the last item is more problematic. Whether schoolwork is consistent with students' personal values and non-school commitments will vary considerably with the students. For the many students culturally distinct from mainstream elites who control schools, schoolwork can violate important roots of self-esteem (Willis, 1977; Ogbu, 1978). A growing literature in the sociology of knowledge (e.g., Young, 1971; Bernstein, 1975) shows that particular conceptions of knowledge and ways of distributing it serve the interest of some groups more than others. To the extent that the kind of knowledge offered and the work required consistently functions to neglect or oppress certain groups, this is obviously alienating.

While there may be difficult obstacles to implementing all of Blauner's criteria, and while some may be inappropriate for certain legitimate student tasks, they offer a fruitful set of ideals for the design of non-alienating schoolwork.

In contrast to Blauner, Oliver (1976) examines work from a broad, evolutionary perspective. He claims that the human species harbors a set of paradoxical, somewhat contradictory tendencies, summarized as primitive and modern aspects of human nature. According to Oliver, the key to high quality of life is to build social institutions that respond, in some balanced fashion, to both our primal and modern needs. Table 2 presents his summary of characteristics of each type of work.

TABLE 2: Modern-Primitive Aspects of Human Functions

[Taken from Oliver (1976, p. 126)]

| WORK | |
|---|---|
| PRIMITIVE | MODERN |
| . visible relationship between work and requirements for survival | . relationship between tasks performed and requirements for survival often remains opaque |
| . nonuniformity of products; personal relationships between people and products | . products of work are uniform and replaceable |
| . less fragmentation of work roles | . highly developed division of labor and work roles |
| . visible relationship between division of labor and efficiency; various parts of a task are visible to all | . relationship between individual task and other tasks required to complete a whole task is often opaque |
| . tasks tend to be associated with the personalities of people, rather than being seen as abstract jobs | . jobs have abstract requirements separated from the personalities of individual workers |
| . contribution of various members of society cannot be reduced to common denominator--money | . value or contribution of individual members of society can be reduced to a common denominator and expressed quantitatively through money |
| . work performed with simple tools owned or controlled by worker | . work performed with complex expensive tools owned by impersonal corporate groups |

- - - - - - - - - - -

The distinctions between primitive and modern work cannot be easily classified as reflecting our concerns for individuality, communality and integration, but they are important to consider, because they chart a conception of contrasting human needs or tendencies which, Oliver argues, must be balanced to attain meaningful work.

Applying Oliver's scheme to schoolwork, we notice the dominance of "modern" aspects. Schoolwork has little direct relationship to

requirements for daily survival, much work is standardized, with abstract requirements for success; it is characterized by high division of labor. To illustrate the salience of abstract requirements for success, note that in primal work such as hunting, gardenign. cooking, evidence of success is concrete and immediately apparent (one does not need a teacher to certify that a spear missed the animal or the fire failed to start). In contrast, much of the work in school is mystifying in the sense that students must rely on the authority of teachers to certify levels of student proficiency. According to criteria like these, schools ought to give more attention to primal forms of work. Such needs are sometimes recognized through school programs in wilderness survival, building and crafts, or child care, but these are usually seen as enrichment options rather than central priorities in schoolwork.

In considering the applicability to schools of criteria for work offered by Blauner or Oliver, it is important to ask whether some, if implemented, might enhance learning, but others interfere with learning. Once we know which criteria might reasonably enhance learning, we should ask about the extent to which their implementation requires administrative-organizational changes in school or whether individual teachers operating in the conventional structure could implement them.

Consider for example reducing alienation in the learning of history. The school organization may require that history be studied only in 50-minute periods, in groups of 30 students, all at a similar age or stage in school, confined to a single classroom, according to a standard pace (three weeks on the American Revolution). The teacher might alleviate some obstacles to individuality and communality by permitting individual choice in topics and individual pacing, providing "primal" learning activities and cooperative group projects. Mastery of some aspects of history, however, may require attention to details and abstractions distant from student concerns, specialized research that cannot be easily integrated with other experience, and memorization of material that seems to have no intrinsic value. The point is not to presume that all traces of alienation can be eliminated from learning, but to minimize those that can be reduced through organizational changes and changes in pedagogy.

## G. Summary

We began by asking whether theory in sociology and the social psychology of organizations offers a clear and consistent set of guidelines for reducing alienation in secondary schools. Our examination of the issues of membership, goals, size, structure, roles, and work does yield a set of principles, stated below in summary fashion. The summary should be interpreted as a set of *prima facie* guidelines, subject to our earlier observation that organizational changes alone will not necessarily reduce alienation (program content and staff performance are also critical), and to many qualifications raised in the preceding analysis.

1. Membership. Ideally student alienation would be reduced if schools were structured more like mutual benefit associations in which groups of people voluntarily join together to promote a form of education that reflects their personal values.

2. Goals. Rather than attempting to accomodate a broad range of educational purposes/philosophies, schools should work toward goals that are clear, limited and internally consistent, because they offer more potential for individual and communal identity than ambiguous, wide-ranging and contradictory goals.

3. Size. Small schools (from about 500-1200) generally offer more opportunities for communality, integration, and persons responding to one another in ways that recognize the total individual.

4. Structure. Schools should be governed through a relatively flat hierarchy such that students and staff can function without periodic approval from a succession of higher offices. There should be wide opportunities for students, staff and parents to affect school governance. In small schools this can occur effectively through informal mechanisms, but they should also have last resort formal mechanisms for students and parents to exercise both voice and exit. The school should aim toward becoming a "rational" organization, but resist levels of formal regulation and bureaucratization that violate individuality and communality.

5. Roles. Students should relate to teachers more on a basis of voluntary choice, should spend sustained time with individual teachers, and should engage in activities with them that go beyond official instructional responsibilities. Students should engage in constructive, cooperative relationships with one another as part of official school roles. Students should also participate in activities that contribute to the functioning and maintenance of the school.

6. Nature of Work. Schoolwork should be consistent with students' personal values, allowing them to develop unique "products," and to work with some flexibility of pace and physical movement. Work should span a complete process of planning and execution and should integrate experience from different subject areas. Finally, it should respond to primal as well as to modern human needs.

In short, if we wish to reduce alienation in secondary schools, we should create school units that are small, with clear, limited goals, voluntarily chosen by students and parents who openly participate in school governance, where students and staff engage in sustained relations in multiple roles, where the student role includes expectations for cooperative endeavors with peers and contributions to the school's operation, and where student work allows for continuous development of "products," with flexibility for individual pacing and attention to both primal and modern work forms.

The ideal is proposed not as a way of solving all problems of schooling or society, but as a way of reducing student alienation within schools. The guidelines do not tell us how to teach effectively or how to assure actual development of competence in students. Neither do they necessarily help to reduce alienation in students' relations beyond the school. The ideal school that the guidelines suggest can be questioned for its contribution to equal opportunity and personal liberty in the society at large. That is, a system aimed toward non-alienating schools of this sort would need safeguards to protect against (a) lack of opportunity for some students (and their parents) to pursue the kind of education they want, either because of discrimination or unequal financial resources; and (b) schools becoming so homogeneous and dogmatic as to deny individuality within the school. Plans to design less alienating schools according to the above guidelines must take these issues, along with many practical considerations into account.

## VI. Reforms in Secondary Education

To what extent have attempts to improve secondary schools responded to guidelines derived in our review of theory? This study cannot undertake an exhaustive review of actual and proposed efforts that have attracted considerable attention, either through widespread implementation or as proposals discussed in professional literature. The reforms to be considered, listed in Table 3, represent only a selective inventory of countless efforts proposed or tried. The list is not offered as a systematic taxonomy of reform efforts, but as a profile for making logical judgments about the extent to which attempts to improve secondary schools are likely to reduce student alienation in school. In the interest of creating a general profile, rather than an endless list of specific innovations, our brief definitions of each item fail to reflect alternative forms that each may take. The reforms are not mutually exclusive, and some efforts may be integrated with others (e.g., specialized schools may be oriented toward career education; educational vouchers might be used to stimulate specialized schools and alternative schools).

TABLE 3: Summary List of Reforms in Secondary Education

School Units

Several innovations have departed from a comprehensive high school that tries to serve all educational needs for large numbers of students, moving instead to smaller units, with general or special programs; or to specialized large units.

1) Schools Within Schools. Smaller units within the comprehensive school in which students remain together for much of their coursework and advising, usually with enhanced opportunities to participate in governance (National Association of Seconday School Principals, 1976; Mosher, 1979-a). The curriculum could be specialized or general.

2) Specialized Schools. Schools aimed toward particular fields such as the performing arts, social service, the health professions, many of which are "magnet" schools (Levine and Havighurst, 1977). Some magnet schools however, are quite similar to the comprehensive high school, except they benefit from added resources and special programs within.

3) Alternative Schools. There are many kinds of alternative schools (Glatthorn, 1975), but here we refer to those consisting of 50-400 students which have a general program and place major emphasis on student autonomy in selection of coursework and extensive opportunities for student and staff participation in governance.

4) Educational Vouchers. Proposals that the financing of education be changed to stimulate greater variety in the kinds of schools available and to permit extensive student-parent choice in which schools to attend.

School Processes and Practices

5) House System. A small unit within the comprehensive high school where students meet for advising, certain extracurricular activities, socializing, a "home" within the larger school. Coupled with an academic program within the house, this would qualify as a school within a school.

6) Personalized Advising. Students assigned to one faculty member, individually or within a group, who spends time with them over the entire high school experience, serving as general guide and source of support.

(continued)

7) Flexible Scheduling. Giving students more control over their time through free periods and off-campus privileges, and varying the time devoted to different activities (e.g., two-hour blocks for some courses, or a special week for field-work).

8) Individually Guided Education. Continuous diagnosis, planning and feedback to design learning activities appropriate to individual goals, abilities, interests. Students work individually with teachers to establish learning objectives, the way they will be accomplished and evaluated (Klausmeier, et al, 1977).

9) Promoting "Pro-Social Conduct." Wynne (1980) has summarized a number of specific practices that stimulate cooperative caring and interaction among students and staff (e.g., student tutoring, hall guards, service clubs, maintaining and decorating the school, fund-raising, along with celebration and recognition of excellence in these areas).

10) Participation in Governance. Conferences, committees, councils, courts and other mechanisms, formal and informal, through which students participate in school governance.

Program Emphases

Some of the most visible kinds of reforms try to affect what students learn in the formal curriculum, to make the material studied in school more useful, relevant, significant. At least four salient movements deserve attention.

11) The Basics. Attention to fundamental general skills in language and mathematics, sometimes including science and social studies.

12) Career-Vocational Education. Curriculum designed for direct application to adult working roles, in technical training, work habits, and in broad awareness for making choices about careers.

13) Challenge Education. Programs based on the belief that youth require a dramatic transition to adulthood that can be achieved only by facing certain difficult tests of oneself and risks in such areas, for example, as physical adventure, service to others, aesthetic creation (Gibbons, 1976).

14) Community-Based Learning. Efforts to reduce the isolation of students in school from adult roles and institutions in the community at large, through field studies, on-the-job experience, community service, political participation.

---

We can assess the reform efforts with regard to each of the five topics (membership, goals, size, structure, roles, work) for which we derived theoretical principles, but first, by using the following phrases, we shall represent the principles even more parsimoniously than presented in the summary (Section G):

1. Voluntary choice
2. Clear-consistent goals
3. Small size
4. Participation
5. Sustained, multiple and cooperative roles
6. Integrated work

Realizing that some of these guidelines signify several ideas that do not necessarily embrace one another (e.g., faculty could spend sustained time with students, but focus only on instructional tasks rather than also functioning with students in other roles), we can nevertheless, make rough judgments on the relevance of each reform effort to each principle as a whole. That is, we can ask, "Is this general effort, whether it be an administrative arrangement, policy, practice or curriculum emphasis, likely, from a logical standpoint, to promote the principle in question?"

As an example, consider the idea of educational vouchers. Because it is based on the premise that parents and students should have more choice in selection of schools, it is likely to promote the principle of voluntary choice. What about clarity and consistency in educational goals? One would assume that, under voucher plans, constituents like-minded about educational purposes would coalesce around certain schools, and in this sense the goals of voucher schools have a strong chance of being less diffuse and ambiguous than those in comprehensive high schools. In considering school size, however, note that vouchers would support both large and small schools, depending upon parent-student preference. Similarly, it is difficult to predict whether vouchers would enhance or stifle participation. While vouchers emphasize participation in the <u>selection</u> of school, they could be implemented in ways that either encourage or discourage student participation in the care and running of the school. Will vouchers have any predictable effect on role relations within a school or upon the nature of schoolwork performed? Since the voucher philosophy includes no notions about the nature of experience within schools, it seems inappropriate even to attempt a prediction about its effect on these matters.

Assessments of this sort, if made for all reform efforts on each of the principles, will yield a general matrix of the extent to which the reform efforts (a) necessarily address the principles in a positive or negative fashion; (b) could either promote or contradict the principles, depending upon how the reforms are implemented, or (c) have no conceivable relationship to the principles. We have made such an assessment, presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4: Ratings of Extent to Which Reforms Implement Principles for Reducing Alienation

| REFORMS: | PRINCIPLES: voluntary choice | clear-consistent educational goals | small size | participation | sustained multiple cooperative roles | integrated work | TOTALS + | TOTALS ? | TOTALS / |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Schools Within Schools | ? | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Specialized Schools | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| Alternative Schools | + | ? | + | + | ? | ? | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Educational Vouchers | + | + | ? | ? | / | / | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| House System | ? | ? | + | ? | ? | / | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Personalized Advising | ? | + | / | ? | ? | / | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Flexible Scheduling | + | / | / | / | ? | ? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Individually Guided Education | ? | + | / | / | ? | ? | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Pro-Social Conduct | / | + | / | ? | + | / | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Participation in Governance | + | ? | / | + | ? | / | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| The Basics | ? | + | / | / | ? | ? | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Career-Vocational Education | + | + | / | / | ? | ? | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Challenge Education | + | ? | / | / | ? | + | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Community Based Learning | + | ? | / | / | ? | + | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| TOTAL: + | 8 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 23 | | |
| ? | 5 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 7 | | 38 | |
| / | 1 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 5 | | | 23 |

KEY:

+ Reform likely to result in practice that promotes the principle.

- Reform likely to result in practice that contradicts the principle.

? Reform could be implemented in ways that promote or contradict the principle.

/ Reform largely irrelevant to the principle, no basis for assessing potential promotion or contradiction.

Before summarizing the analysis, let us illustrate the reasoning behind a few of the ratings. Schools within schools were judged likely to promote small size, as were alternative schools and house systems, because the rationale for their existence is to create units with small numbers of students. Note, however, that students might be assigned either voluntarily or involuntarily to schools within schools (?) and that educational goals for such schools might be either clear or ambiguous (?). One would expect all programs of individually guided education to help clarify learning goals for each student (+), because that is one of the premises of the movement, but IGE programs may or may not construct specific school work to conform to criteria for integrated work (?). Efforts to promote active student participation in governance or pro-social conduct, while easier to implement in small schools, can occur in large or small schools and is not likely to affect the size of school itself (/). Community-based learning is usually advocated on the grounds that students deserve more choice in learning enviornments (+), but emphasis on learning in places beyond the school is largely irrelevant to promotion of student participation in school governance (/).

Considering the ratings as a whole, the good news is that none of the reforms seems likely to contradict any of the principles, and that each reform seems likely to promote at least one of the principles. The bad news is that no single reform is likely to be consistent with more than three principles, and that most of the cells (38 out of 84) are filled with ?, which means that the reforms, while they have the potential to fulfill the principles, also have the potential to violate them, depending upon how they are implemented. Of the fourteen reform efforts, about half positively address problems of student choice and goal clarity, but no more than a few necessarily address alienation in the four remaining problem areas. This inventory, based on logical analysis, rather than empirical study, shows that most of the salient reform efforts in secondary education should be viewed either as two-edged swords capable of reducing or exacerbating student alienation in school or as efforts unlikely to affect alienation at all. This is not to condemn any of the efforts, for several do speak positively to some of our criteria, and many reforms are probably implemented in ways consistent with other criteria. The review indicates, however, that reform efforts as a whole give little direct attention to reducing alienation.

It is conceivable, of course, that our assessment proceded from a misleading perspective. Rather than making an inventory of reform efforts, it might make more sense simply to examine individual schools to determine the extent to which they have created environments consistent with our criteria. Perhaps a large number of schools are organized to reflect many, if not all, of the principles. I suspect that some such schools do exist. This study could not conduct a systematic national search for such places, but a literature search and

consultation with various national authorities on secondary education, uncovered not a single public comprehensive high school that met most of the criteria. (*)

The literature on innovation often focuses on national practices rather than on particular schools. When particular schools are mentioned, they are described primarily with reference to a narrow construct such as decision-making structure, or curricular program, or staff perceptions of climate, not through a comprehensive description of the school's goals, program, governance structure, role relationships and nature of student work that would permit inferences about levels of alienation. The profession and the public could benefit greatly from a national representative file of holistic descriptions of school environments that would allow practitioners, scholars and the public at large to see how particular schools handle problems as specialized as drug counseling or as broad as alienation. Hopefully, data collected by Goodlad (forthcoming) will be presented in ways that fill part of this information gap.

The lack of exemplary schools promoting individuality, communality and integration may be in part illusory, due to our lack of information. There is good reason to believe, however, that such schools are truly rare. Analyses of implementation of innovation (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978), of the politics of schooling (Wirt, 1975), and of organizational dynamics (Meyer and Associates, 1978) point rather consistently to the conclusion that school policies emerge largely in response to problems of concern to specific interests that focus in a piecemeal way on limited aspects of school life: crime and vandalism, moral and values education, integration and racism, competence testing, teenage pregnancy, youth unemployment. The preoccupation with such visible topics tends to deflect attention away from the more general, admittedly abstract, concern for reducing alienation in students' total experience. (**)

---

(*)Examples of literature consulted included Rogers (1977), Levine and Hivighurst (1977), Abramowitz and Tenenbaum (1978), Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (1978), Park (1978), Burns (1979), Carnegie Council (1979), Klausmeier (1979), Wynne (1980).

(**)Much work has been devoted to study and improvement of "school climate" (McDill and Rigsby, 1973), but the school climate movement while emphasizing openness, trust, mutual participation in problem-solving, has largely neglected underlying structures, role definitions, and conceptions of work that undermine the possibilities for individuality, communality and integration.

A fragmented approach to school improvement is reinforced not only through preoccupation with special topics, but also because of specialization in the roles of change agents themselves. Administrators tend to focus on organizational and administrative arrangements, leaving issues of program content to curriculum specialists and teachers. Curriculum developers focus on program content with little attention to the organizational context or to staff development. Teacher educators often limit their attention to staff interaction with students and pedagogical techniques, with scarce attention to the problem of integration of content or to organizational structure. The net result is that few efforts at school improvement examine student life in a comprehensive manner that fits innovations into a general scheme for promoting individuality, communality and integration.

The failure to attend to the totality of students' experience is illustrated further in what I consider to be four dominant ideological perspectives on educational reform. The conventional role perspective operates with a conception of competencies and attitudes for successful performance in familiar adult roles of breadwinner, family member, or citizen and tries to cast educational experience to transmit the knowledge and values required for specific role performance. This orientation seems dominant, and can be expressed in a rather liberal format that emphasizes placing students in positions of responsibility that require independent thought-action in careers and community activities, in addition to traditional classroom instruction. It also finds expression in conservative proposals that stress teaching students to submit to authority, to learn the fundamentals of basic literacy and discipline in school before undertaking autonomous roles in the adult community. Both liberal and conservative strains of conventional role ideology may emphasize pro-social behavior in caring for others, respect for property, law obedience. The general perspective is analogous to what Kohlberg and Mayer (1972) call the ideology of cultural transmission; it rejects notions of transcendent individual fulfillment and social reconstruction as primary goals of education.

In contrast, the developmental perspective focuses on individual growth along dimensions that include, but transcend, respect for conventional roles. The perspective assumes that attainment of competence and values depends not simply upon transmission of culture and reinforcing particular behaviors. Rather, competence emerges as biologically grounded stages/structures of thought and feeling interact with the environment. The task of education from the developmental point of view is to stimulate this dialectical process between person and environment so as to help individuals continue to grow in such developmental dimensions as cognitive complexity, moral reasoning, ego integration, etc. This involves "trying on" conventional roles, but no commitment to accept them unless they meet the test of open individual inquiry. Based largely on the work of Dewey, Erickson, and Piaget, the developmental perspective is well articulated by Kohlberg and Mayer (1972) and represented in models of schooling advocated by Mosher (1979-b) and Conrad and Hedin (1977).

The perspective of structural emancipation begins with a concern for how formal education contributes to the domination of some people by others. Ultimately aimed at social equality and individual emancipation, the perspective is analagous to what was formerly considered the "social reconstructionist" view. While structural emancipators operate largely from a Marxian framework and the social reconstructionist from a liberal democratic philosophy, the central concern of each is how schooling might contribute to attaining a greater degree of social justice. By studying how the organization of knowledge and processes of schooling favor certain social interests over others and reinforce social stratification, the structural emancipation perspective highlights how reforms that may appear beneficial from any of the three other perspectives may actually block progress toward equality and individual emancipation. This perspective, anchored in the work of Marx and Habermas, is represented in Young (1971), Bowles and Gintis (1976) and Apple (1979).

Finally, from the professional technological perspective, the central problem is to specify instructional objectives more clearly, to create instructional materials, pedagogical techniques and organizational processes for achieving the objectives, regardless of the content or philosophy underlying a school program. This perspective usually claims ideological neutrality, suggesting that training for either conventional roles, for developmental growth, or for raised consciousness about social inequality can be instituted either efficiently and professionally or sloppily with great waste of human resources. The perspective is represented in national curriculum development efforts, the competency-based education movement, individually guided education.

Arguments over priorities in reform may hinge on disagreements among these perspectives. Developmentalists will criticize professional technologists for being insensitive to natural capabilities of students at different ages. Conventional role advocates will condemn the structural emancipation perspective on the grounds that it offers no assistance for individuals trying to cope with immediate problems in an imperfect world. The structural emancipator will fault the professional technologists for failing to perceive the way in which the professionalization of education contributes to human exploitation. Professional technologists will criticize advocates in each orientation for failure to specify in sufficient detail the student outcomes and teaching practices they seek to advance.

We cannot resolve differences among these perspectives, but it is instructive to note how each seems to avoid attacking alienation in the students' total school experience. The developmental and conventional role perspectives tend to focus on limited program goals such as experiences in inquiry, moral reasoning, peer-counseling, employment, adequate punishment for vandalism. Many of these may be

worthwhile in the sense of developing competence and meeting some of the criteria in our principles. However, the concern that students gain particular experiences, either for the promotion of developmental growth or for adaptation to existing roles, deflects attention away from the problem of integrating experience or the quality of life in school as a whole. Some proposals from these perspectives do address the total school experience; for example, the just community school from the developmental camp, or the prosocial behavior orientation from the conventional role camp, but there are no fundamental assumptions in the perspectives themselves that stimulate attention to the total environment.

In contrast, the structural emancipation perspective, based in Marx, is philosophically tied to a concern for alienation. Unfortunately, however, recent expressions of the perspective pay little attention to building less alienating schools. Instead they focus simply on raising individual student consciousness regarding the nature of oppression-exploitation, or argue that the school is so embedded in a larger social structure of alienated relations that school alienation cannot be reduced without fundamental social change.

Finally, the professional technological perspective is so committed to specialization as a way of solving human problems and so convinced of its own value-neutrality, that quality of life in school rarely becomes an important issue. Instead, issues are construed narrowly on how to increase reading scores or how to prevent violence in the school, and solutions are sought by consulting those with expertise in these areas, rather than those interested in reduction of alienation in general.

The failure of each reform perspective to reduce student alienation in schools can be understood in the context of general public consciousness about the purpose of education. In short, prevailing beliefs seem close to these:

-- The essential purpose of schooling is to teach each individual student certain competence and values.

-- This may require specialized environments in which students must be alienated to some degree from their work and from people.

-- As long as teaching and learning in the desired directions are accomplished, such alienation should be tolerated.

-- It is the responsibility of private institutions such as family, church, or voluntary associations, but not the state acting through the school, to deal with the more general, difficult to define, and socially controversial problem of alienation.

Unless it becomes dramatically clear that schools fail to educate most students in the desired directions, reform efforts will continue to neglect students' alienation in school. In spite of considerable controversy on the academic effectiveness of schooling, and of evidence of increasing fighting, vandalism, homicide, suicide among adolescents, general public confidence in the public schools remains relatively high (Gallup, 1980). If most students make it through high school (the national average dropout rate is about 25 percent), if a significant portion of these demonstrate engagement and hard work, if many find opportunities for employment or higher education, and if schools continue to function in a reasonably orderly fashion (buses run, lunch is served, grades are submitted), there is little reason to believe that schools fail so miserably that they should re-examine their goals, structure, roles, and work with regard to the problem of alienation. Instead, problems that do appear, with relatively small portions of students, can be tackled in a piecemeal fashion. With no sense of public urgency about the total pattern of relations toward work and people within schools, we can understand why neither the specific reform devices listed in Table 3 nor the general reform perspectives address student alienation in a comprehensive way.

## VII. Summary and Conclusion

The study began by asking whether literature on alienation and the sociology and social psychology of organizations might suggest organizational remedies for students' lack of commitment to the work, the people, and the facilities of public comprehensive high schools. Our definition of alienation emphasized the themes of fragmentation, estrangement, separation and detachment identified in previous analyses. In spite of a common tendency to equate alienation with almost all forms of negative affect or struggle, we urged that, to be helpful in discussions of student alienation in schools, the term should be limited to the theme of detachment-estrangement, both objectively and subjectively, from work, people and physical environment. Since a certain degree of alienation inevitably constitutes part of the human condition, the intent is not to eliminate alienation, but to reduce or minimize its adverse forms. Rather than working exclusively from the somewhat negative perspective of minimizing alienation in schools, we chose to identify criteria for reducing alienation that could be stated in a more positve sense. We argued that reducing alienation could be construed as equivalent to promoting individuality, communality and integration, in both objective conditions and subjective states.

It is not self-evident that schools ought deliberately to reduce alienation, but we made a case for doing so, on the pedagogical claim that student engagement is necessary for learning, and also on the moral claim that public institutions like schools have an obligation to promote high quality of life for participants in their midst. At

the same time, we recognized that effective teaching of students involves far more than reducing alienation, that reducing alienation within school would not necessarily alleviate alienation in students' lives beyond school, and that some school environments which might evidence unity, spirit, and engagement for most students could conceivably perpetrate injustice upon individual members or non-members. In this sense reduction of alienation was advocated as a necessary, but by no means a sufficient condition for effective democratic education.

The study limited its focus to organizational features of schooling (nature of goals, structure, roles of participants), acknowledging also the powerful influence of program features (the content of courses taught, the nature of curricular activities), and of staff performance (the competence and sensitivity of teachers and administrators) in affecting alienation and student learning.

With these boundaries in mind, the study searched seminal literature in sociology and social psychology of organizations for guidelines or principles for promoting individuality, communality and integration for students in secondary schools. We examined the basis for membership in organizations; the problem of goal clarity and consitency; the influence of organizational size; structural features such as degreee of hierarchy, participants' roles in governance, and the extent to which rational versus natural dynamics dominate the organization's life. Student roles in relation to teacher, to peers, and to the school as a whole were analyzed, as was the nature of schoolwork itself.

A variety of literature, while not addressing these issues specifically, led to several general guidelines: secondary schools can reduce student alienation to the extent that (1) student membership in the school and in activities therein is voluntary; (2) goals are clear, limited, and consistent; (3) size of the student body is roughly from 500-1200; (4) there is a low degree of hierarchy, with ample opportunity for student input in governance (through voice and the threat of exit); (5) students spend sustained time with individual teachers, engage in constructive schoolwork with peers, and contribute to the functioning of the school itself; (6) schoolwork allows for student autonomy in pace and working styles, engages students in a complete process of planning and execution of work that integrates aspects of different subjects, and provides both primal and modern forms of work.

In reviewing a number of major reforms in secondary education, for example, schools within schools, individually guided education, challenge education, we concluded that most reforms do not necessarily lead to practice consistent with most of the guidelines, although each reform is likely to be consistent with at least one of the six. Most of the reforms are capable of either reducing or exacerbating

student alienation, depending upon how they are implemented. In reviewing four salient ideological perspectives on educational reform, we indicated how none attack student alienation in a comprehensive way. Instead, efforts at school improvement focus only on limited facets of students' experience, with few attempts to integrate different aspects of school life. This is explainable by value pluralism in the society at large, by the politics of interests groups, and by the fact that the public seems more interested in the building of student competencies than in the general quality of life in school.

The burden of the study was not to make a case for the urgency of the problem of student alienation. Thus, we did not gather empirical evidence on the degree of alienation that students feel. From common knowledge of secondary school structure and program, however, we have shown a number of ways in which students are objectively detached from schoolwork, from people in school and from the facilities. We made a case for reducing this detachment through the promotion of individuality, communality and integration, and we suggested how certain organizational factors could assist in this mission. Given reasonably high levels of public satisfaction with schools, however, most reforms will probably continue to avoid comprehensive responses to the suggested guidelines. Certainly it is possible to learn in alienating environments, as has been shown by countless slaves, prison inmates and bureaucrats who have educated themselves under most adverse circumstances. The human ability to cope is perhaps a major deterent to improving school life.

## VIII. References


Abramowitz, Susan and Ellen Tenenbaum. High School '77: A Survey of Public Secondary School Principals. Washington,DC: National Institute of Education, 1978.

Aiken, Michael and Jerald Hage. "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative Analysis," American Sociological Review, 31, August, 1966, pp. 497-507.

Apple, Michael W. Ideology and Curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.

Asner, Martha R. and James Broschart (Eds). Violent Schools - Safe Schools: The Safe School Study Report to the Congress, Vol. I. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, 1978.

Barker, Roger and Paul Gump. Big School, Small School: High School Size and Student Behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.

Berger, Peter L. and Richard Neuhaus. To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1977.

Berman, Paul and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. Federal Programs Supporting Education Change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1978.

Bernstein, Basil. Class, Codes and Control, Vol. 3, Toward a Theory of Educational Transmissions. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Bidwell, Charles. "The School as a Formal Organization," in J. March (Ed), Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965.

Bidwell, Charles, "Students and Schools: Some Observations on Client Trust in Client-Serving Institutions," in William R. Rosengren and Mark Lefton (Eds), Organizations and Clients. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1970.

Blau, Peter M. and W.R. Scott. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.

Blauner, Robert, Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Blumberg, Arthur and William Greenfield. The Effective Principal. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976.

Braverman, H. Labor and Monopoly Capital. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.

Brown, B. Frank (Ed). The Reform of Secondary Education: A Report to the Public and the Profession. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973.

Burns, Thomas. The Urban High School Reform Initiative, Final Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education, 1979.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Giving Youth A Better Chance: Options for Education, Work and Service. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Coleman, James S. Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, Youth Transition to Adulthood. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Conrad, Dan and Diane Hedin. "Citizenship Education Through Participation," in B. Frank Brown (Ed), Education for Responsible Citizenship. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1977.

Corwin, Ronald G. "Models of Educational Organizations," in Fred N. Kerlinger and John B. Carroll (Eds), Review of Research in Education, 2. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1974.

Cusick, Philip A. Inside High School: The Students' World. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1973.

Dachler, H. Peter and Bernard Wilpert. "Conceptual Dimensions and Boundaries of Participation in Organizations: A Critical Evaluation," Administrative Science Quarterly, 23:1, March, 1978, pp. 1-39.

Deal, Terrence E. And Lynn D. Celotti, "How Much Influence Do (and Can) Educational Administrators have on Classrooms?" Phi Delta Kappan, 61:7, March, 1980, pp. 471-473.

Ehman, Lee H. and Judith A. Gillespie, "Political Life in the Hidden Curriculum: Does it Make a Difference?" Paper presented to National Council for the Social Studies, Chicago, November, 1974.

Epstein, Joyce L. and James M. McPartland. "Family and School Interactions and Main Effects on Affective Outcomes," Report No. 235. Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, 1977.

Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and Society. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1960.

Etzioni, Amatai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press, 1961.

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Educational Programs That Work, 5th Ed. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1978.

Gallup, George H. "The 12th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 62:1, September, 1980, pp. 33-48.

Garbarino, James, "The Human Ecology of School Crime: A Case for Small Schools," in Ernst Wenk and Nora Harlow (Eds), School Crime and Disruption: Prevention Models. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, 1978.

Garbarino, James. "Some Thoughts on School Size and Its Effects on Adolescent Development," Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 9:1,

Gibbons, Maurice. The New Secondary Education: A Phi Delta Kappa Task Force Report. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, 1976.

Glatthorn, Allan. Alternatives in Education: Schools and Programs. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., Inc., 1975

Goodlad, John I. The Dynamics of Educational Change. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.

_____ A Study of Schooling, (forthcoming). University of California, Los Angeles.

Gottfredson, Gary D. and Denise Daiger. Disruption in Six Hundred Schools, Report #289. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools, 1979.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "Organizational Analysis," in Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (Eds), Sociology Today. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959.

Hirschman, Albert O. Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Hoy, Wayne K., Richard Blazovsky, and Wayne Newland. "Organizational Structure and Alienation from Work." Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April, 1980.

Johnson, David W. and Roger T. Johnson. Learning Together and Alone: Cooperation, Competition, and Individualization. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

Katz, Daniel and Robert L. Kahn. The Social Psychology of Organizations, 2nd Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1978.

Kohlberg, Lawrence and Rochelle Mayer. "Development as the Aim of Education," Harvard Educational Review, 42:4, November, 1972, pp. 449-496.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "High School Democracy in Educating for a Just Society," in Ralph L. Mosher (Ed), Moral Education: First Generation of Research and Development. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1980.

Klausmeier, H.J., R.A. Rossmiller and M. Saily (Eds). Individually Guided Elementary Education. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Klausmeier, H.J. Profiles of Selected Innovating Secondary Schools. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling, 1979.

Levine, Daniel U. and Robert J. Havighurst (Eds). The Future of Big-City Schools: Desegregation Policies and Magnet Alternatives. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1977.

Lichtheim, George. "Alienation," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. I. New York: Macmillan Co., 1968, pp. 264-268.

Lipsky, Michael. Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services. New York: Russell Sage, 1980.

Long, Samuel. "Urban Adolescents and the Political System: Dimensions of Disaffection," Theory and Research in Social Education, 8:1, Winter, 1980, pp. 31-43.

March, James G. (Ed). Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965.

March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen. Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations. Bergen: Universitets forlaget, 1976.

McDill, Edward L. and Leo C. Rigsby. Structure and Process in Secondary Schools: The Academic Impact of Educational Climates. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Meyer, Marshall W. and Associates. Environments and Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Meyer, John W. and Brian Rowan. "The Structure of Educational Organizations," in Marshall W. Meyer and Associates (Eds), Environments and Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Meyer, John W., W. Richard Scott and Terrence E. Deal. "Institutional and Technical Sources or Organizational Structure: Explaining the Structure of Educational Organizations." Palo Alto: Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, 1979.

Mosher, Ralph L. "A Democratic High School: Damn It, Your Feet Are Always in the Water," in Ralph L. Mosher (Ed), Adolescents' Development and Education. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1979-a.

_____ (Ed). Adolescents' Development and Education. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1979-b.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. "Schools Within Schools," The Practitioner, 3:1, September, 1976, pp. 1-12.

National Panel on High School and Adolescent Education. The Education of Adolescents. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Nisbet, Robert A. Community and Power. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

_____ The Sociological Tradition. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.

_____ The Social Bond: An Introduction to the Study of Society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1970.

Ogbu, John U. Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1978.

Oliver, Donald W. Education and Community: A Radical Critique of Innovative Schooling. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1976.

Ollman, Bertell. Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society, 2nd Edition. London: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Park, Jeanne S. (Ed). Education in Action: 50 Ideas That Work. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Rogers, David. An Inventory of Educational Improvement Efforts in The New York City Public Schools. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1977.

Rutter, Michael, Barbara Maughan, Peter Mortimore and Janet Outson with Alan Smith. Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Schacht, Richard. Alienation. New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1970.

Schneider, Barbara. America's Small Schools. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, Las Cruces, NM, 1980.

Seeley, David S. Voice, Choice and Loyalty in Education: The Reconstructions of Public School Policy. New York: Ballinger Publishing Co. (forthcoming).

Seeman, Melvin. "Alienation and Engagement," in A. Campbell and P.E. Converse (Eds), The Human Meaning of Social Change. New York: Russell Sage, 1972.

_____ "Alienation Studies," Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 1. Palo Alto: Annual Reviews, Inc., 1975.

Spady, William. "The Authority System of the School and Student Unrest: A Theoretical Exploration," in C. Wayne Gordon (Ed), The Seventy-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Sprinthall, Norman A. "Learning Psychology by Doing Psychology: A High School Curriculum in the Psychology of Counseling," in Ralph L. Mosher (Ed), Adolescents' Development and Education. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1979.

Stake, Robert E. and Jack A. Easley. Case Studies in Science Education. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation, 1978.

Weick, Karl E. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems," Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1976, pp. 1-19.

_____ The Social Psychology of Organizing. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1979.

Willis, Paul E. Learning to Labour. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co., 1977.

Wirt, Frederick M. (Ed). The Polity of the School. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co., 1975.

Wise, Arthur E. Legislated Learning: The Bureaucratization of the American Classroom. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.

Wynne, Edward A. Looking at Schools: Good, Bad and Indifferent. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co., 1980.

Young, Michael F. (Ed). Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.

Zwerdling, Daniel. Democracy at Work. Washington, DC: Association for Self-Management, 1978.